IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5906 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA Sd/-

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

BHARGAV GAYAPRASAD VERMA

Versus

UNION OF INDIA

Appearance:

MR RASIK V MANDANI for Petitioner No. 1

MR DN PATEL for Respondent Nos.1-2

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

Date of decision: 20/07/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Rule. Mr.D.N.Patel, learned Sr. Central Govt. Standing Counsel appears and waives service of rule on behalf of the respondents. By consent of the learned Counsel appearing for the respective parties the matter is taken up for final hearing today.

2. In this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner has prayed for a writ of mandamus directing the respondent authority to allow him to rectify the error in the passport application in respect of the petitioner's date of birth and place of birth as per Birth Certificate issued by the competent

authority under the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

3. As the petitioner is desirous of immigrating to foreign country, he applied for issuance of passport in a prescribed form. Thereafter he came to know about the discrepancies in respect of his birth date and birth place. It was revealed that his date of birth was mentioned incorrectly instead of 12-12-1970 and birth place was also mentioned incorrectly instead of Rochan Manikpur village. The petitioner requested the respondent authority to issue passport after making change in the passport application in respect of his birth date and birth place. However, the said request of the petitioner was turned down. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present petition.

4. In view of the settled position that if there is any discrepancy in the birth date or birth place recorded in the birth certificate issued by the competent authority and any other document the former should normally prevail, the Regional Passport Officer should not have had any hesitation in accepting the petitioner's request for showing the correct birth date or birth place in the passport on the basis of the certificate issued by the concerned authority.

5. In view of the above discussion, the petition is allowed. The Regional Passport Office is directed to consider the petitioner's request for change in the date of birth and place of birth of the petitioner in the passport application in accordance with law on the basis of the material which may be placed before it and shall pass appropriate orders within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of writ of this Court or a certified copy of this judgment, whichever is earlier. In case the petitioner is required to apply for a fresh passport, the petitioner shall comply with the requisite formalities for the same.

6. In light of the fact that the petitioner has already applied for a passport and the present litigation is at the behest of the petitioner, the petitioner to pay the cost to the extent of Rs.2,500/= (Rupees Two thousand five hundred only).

7. The petition is accordingly allowed in terms as aforesaid. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. Direct service is permitted.

Sd/-

(D.A.Mehta,J)

'Bhavesh'